

**Minutes**  
**STATE SOIL CONSERVATION BOARD MEETING**  
**9:00 a.m. Tuesday, August 14, 2007**  
**Indiana State Library**  
**History Reference Room #211**  
**140 N. Senate Avenue**  
**Indianapolis, IN 46204**

**Attendance**

**SSCB Members**

Bob Eddleman  
Larry Clemens  
Warren Baird  
Bill Mann  
Jim Cherry  
Nola Gentry  
Gary Conant

Jon Roberts, IASWCD  
Lyle Burtsfield, IASWCD  
Jennifer Boyle, IASWCD  
Jim Droege, IASWCD  
Jack Corpuz, Pheasants Forever  
Bob Weaver, Johnson SWCD  
Ric Schlosser, Johnson SWCD  
Glenn Lange, Marion Co. SWCD  
Ron Lauster, Marion Co. SWCD  
Gene Weaver, Ohio Co. SWCD  
Gwen White, DNR LARE  
Gary Steinhardt, Purdue  
Greg Lake, Allen Co. SWCD  
Lynn Dennis, TNC  
Marylou Renshaw, IDEM  
Robert Woodling, Monroe Co. SWCD

**Audience**

Kelly Gentry, ISDA  
Tammy Lawson, ISDA  
Jerod Chew, ISDA  
Deb Fairhurst, ISDA  
Seth Harden, ISDA  
Andrew Pursifull, ISDA  
Amy Eizinger, ISDA  
Scott Trennepohl, ISDA

**9:00 AM: Call to Order**

Bob Eddleman welcomed everyone to the August 14, 2007 SSCB meeting.

**Draft Minutes of June 2007**

Bill Mann moved to approve the minutes as presented. Nola Gentry seconded and the motion carried.

**Leadership Development**

**Supervisor Resignations/Appointments – Tammy Lawson**

Kelly Gentry presented the temporary appointments and supervisor request from Vanderburgh, Wells, and Johnson SWCDs.

Vanderburgh requested the supervisor appointment of Davie Sue Wallace Litov due to the resignation of Holly McCutchan. Wells requested the supervisor appointment of Jody Nusbaumer due to the death of Lamoine Nusbaumer. Johnson requested the temporary appointment of Beth McNabb due to the resignation of Bruce Findley.

Nola Gentry moved to approve the request of temporary appointment of Johnson SWCD. Jim Cherry seconded and the motion carried.

Jim Cherry moved to approve the request of supervisor appointments of Vanderburgh and Wells SWCDs. Gary Conant seconded and the motion carried.

**CWI Request-Amy Eizinger** <http://www.in.gov/isda/2726.htm>

Clark-See Link.

Gentry moved to approve the Clark request. Baird seconded. Discussion followed and the motion carried.

Gibson-See Link. Discussion followed.

Gentry moved to approve the Gibson request. Cherry seconded and the motion carried.

Jay-See Link

Cherry moved to approve the Jay request. Conant seconded. Discussion followed and motion carried.

Tippecanoe-See Link.

Gentry would like to see some clarification of their request. Eddleman is some what concerned with the request. This kind of incentive was discussed early on and is something that the board might want to revisit for future grant opportunities that offer SWCDs incentives. There was concern pertaining to the follow up for landowners and level of activity that a contractor might bring to the project. This request seems to change the intent of the grant. There may need to be follow ups.

Gentry moved to deny the Tippecanoe request. Clemens seconded. Discussion followed and the motion carried.

**District Request-Bob Eddleman** <http://www.in.gov/isda/2726.htm>

Putnam-See Link.

Tammy Lawson mentioned that this was not a request simply a Putnam County SWCD concern warranting SSCB recognition.

Ohio AFR submission-See Link.

Request was tabled at the June 2007 SSCB meeting due to an incomplete AFR. Lawson explained figures. DSC and the SSCB may need to work with the SWCD and county officials to clarify the expectations for the coming year. Ohio has not received any funds this year to date. Gene Weaver explained that Ohio County is struggling to get funding. There is no office or SWCD staff. Gentry asked where the extension office is located in Ohio County and if there was room there for a more official SWCD office. Weaver mentioned the County Commissioners do not want to waste space and funding if there will not be full utilization.

Ohio Co. SWCD fiscal year is different than the SSCB. The AFR is a review of the financial activity from the past year. The funding in question equals \$7,000. Clemens asked if we made a motion to not except their request will this affect any other grants they have applied for. Lawson did not believe so. More discussion of the duties of the current extension office staff followed. Gentry stated the SWCD should probably reside within the extension office. It would be a good

idea to explain the law to Ohio Co. and possibly a letter explaining the SSCB decision and ongoing concerns.

Baird moved to approve Ohio Co. AFR for \$10k match for last year and to work with them and the County Commissioners to alleviate the concerns and assist Ohio County SWCD in securing long term funding. Mann seconded and motion carried.

### **SSCB Chairman's Report-Bob Eddleman**

#### **CWI Funding \$ Next Steps**

#### **SSCB Sub Committee Reports and Recommendations (see attachments)**

#### **District Capacity Committee Report and Recommendations-Nola Gentry**

(Gentry will e-mail report)

The District Capacity Committee has recently met regarding training grants. They support the leadership institute and suggest having one DSC staff designated to work on this task. The District Capacity Committee came up with two recommendations. The first is to use \$20k of the CWI money as a revolving fund designated to help with costs. The second is to increase the training grants from \$750 to \$1000 based on supervisor participation. There was discussion to increase the CWI matching grants to \$1100 instead of increasing the training grant; however after discussion they decided to keep it separate. Leadership training grants should be for supervisors and key district employees.

Jim Droege reported IASWCDs main concern is whose responsibility would this fall on? They will need time to have that role explained.

Lawson mentioned the SSCB has not had time to submit their comments as a board and as individuals. Even though it is not on the agenda for today's meeting, it is something we might want to find time for.

#### **CWI Grants Committee Report and Recommendations - Warren Baird**

The CWI Grants Committee met last week to discuss the CWI Grants Program. Based on the input from the area meetings and partners, their recommendation is to discontinue the idea of Watershed Administrators. They would also like to increase the funding and revise requirements on training grants, establish funding for the Indiana Conservation Leadership Institute, eliminate multi-year grant categories and update existing grant categories to meet accountability expectations.

A few other recommendations the CWI Grants Committee came up with would be to work with IDEM on establishing new Grant Category allowing districts to apply for portions of the match required by other grants, and establish a cost share program for Nutrient Management

#### **Executive Committee Report and Recommendations-Bob Eddleman**

The Executive Committee met with other DSC staff to discuss comments made through the area input meetings. Key concerns included partnership morale, financial obligations, and the need to focus on one broad conservation issue.

The recommendations from the Executive Committee include continuing to support CREP and future expansion as funding allows, have a revolving fund of \$15,000 to \$25,000 of CWI funds be established to implement the Leadership Institute, increase the Training Incentive grant from \$750 to \$1,000, increase the matching grant to each SWCD by \$1,000, and to delay further decisions regarding CWI until a task force of partnership members helps determine a focus for the CWI Initiative.

### **Other Comments from SSCB members**

#### **Jim Cherry**

Over the last month there has been a lot of discussion on budget. There is not enough funding to do everything. As a farmer in Hancock Co. it was going to take one year to get technical assistance on a waterway plan. The wait is too long. Money should go to the soil and we all have that responsibility. All recommendations from the sub-committees are good ideas. We will find a way to best utilize the money. We need the partnership to pull together.

#### **Nola Gentry**

We've spent a lot of time thinking about this issue. Reading through comments and going to the input meetings we have heard a lot of good comments. There are a lot of concerns. We have charged up SWCDs to think outside the box. Each district has sat down and came up with their ideas. To do the popular thing we could divide the money by 92 counties. If we did that then we wouldn't see conservation on the ground. It doesn't give a lot of money to each district to focus on conservation. We have to find an easy goal for everyone to understand. We also need more partners to get involved. People knew what T by 2000 meant. Through the meetings we found out there is a lot of distrust. People thought it was a done deal. We had to throw something out there to start with, which got people thinking. I think with time we will be able to come out with a good proposal. There is a lot more to accomplish.

#### **Larry Clemens**

We have 5 million dollars worth of ideas and only \$500,000 to use. Our decision will have to be able to tee up the next 2 years. We need to show Legislatures what we've done with the CWI money in 2 years.

#### **Bob Eddleman**

I agree with what we have heard from all the comments. We need to decide what part of water quality we want to focus on. Jane Hardisty met with the executive committee. We talked about ways to work with USDA funds and CWI funds to build our capacity. That is another reason we need more time.

#### **Warren Baird**

It would make a difference if some could come up with another slogan like T by 2000. Something that people will remember.

### **Partnership Comments**

#### **Jim Droege – IASWCD**

Droege stated that the SSCB needs to come up with a strategic focus. Partnership relations haven't been the best. He personally feels this is the opportunity to work together. The partnership

has the same goals, but different authority. Areas where we overlap we work together and those areas we don't overlap are where we disagree. He looks forward to working together to come up with a common goal.

**Jane Hardisty – NRCS**

Hardisty thanked the SSCB. She appreciated the fact that the SSCB has listened to the comments made and she agrees with the sub-committees recommendations. The budget is forcing partners to do things differently. She looks forward to talking about how to get more conservation on the ground. She discussed the future rent and computer support cost of \$969,000 and how NRCS can no longer provide the technical assistance. SWCDs cost will double or triple. She thinks the partnership will start getting stronger over the next few months.

**Gene Weaver – Ohio Co. SWCD**

Weaver is disappointed about the comments made about the partnership. He likes the idea of CWI and its current direction. DNR and IDEM should be a part of the partnership. We need outside groups that have a different view on conservation.

**Greg Lake – Allen Co. SWCD**

Lake suggested once the SSCB moves into this next phase to give districts an opportunity to input on the focus for CWI.

**Bob Eddleman - review of the SSCB recommendations and proposals**

See Executive Committee Report attachment

1. Place \$20k into a revolving fund for the Leadership Institute.
2. Increase the training grant from \$750 to \$1000. The difference of \$750 should be used for supervisor and/or employees.
3. Support and expansion of CREP
4. Operations matching grant be increase by \$1000
5. Delay further decisions regarding CWI until a task force of partnership members helps determine a focus for the CWI Initiative.

**5 MINUTE BREAK**

11:17 AM Eddleman called the meeting back to order.

**\$20k revolving fund for Leadership Institute**

Gentry moved to place \$20k of CWI money in a revolving fund for the Leadership Institute. Cherry seconded. Discussion followed and the motion carried.

**Increase the training grant from \$750 to \$1000**

Gentry explained that SWCD Supervisors need to come on board and encourage more experience. She recommends increasing the training grant by \$500 or \$750 and the additional funds must be used for supervisor training. The SSCB should restrict the new \$750 for supervisor training since there is already \$750 for staff training. Eddleman clarified the training grant would be \$1500; \$750 for staff, \$750 for supervisors. Gene Weaver asked what the time

frame for the funds would be. Eddleman mentioned that it would have to be on the state fiscal year.

Cherry made a motion to increase the training grant from \$750 to \$1500 in which the additional \$750 will be designated for supervisor training. Nola seconded and the motion carried.

### **CREP support and possible expansion**

At the public input meetings it was rumored that the SSCB was discontinuing CREP; however, CREP was never up for discussion.

Baird made a motion to continue SSCB support for CREP and consider expansion as funding allows. Mann seconded and the motion carried.

### **Increase the matching grant from \$10,000 to \$11,000**

Baird mentioned SSCB just increased the training grant and a decision on increasing the matching grants shouldn't be made until further discussion on the CWI funding. Gentry agreed. That would be \$92,000 the SSCB could use for other grant programs. The Board needs to wait until they get a focus narrowed down for CWI funds.

Baird made a motion to leave the matching grant program at \$10,000 until further discussion. Gentry seconded and the motion carried.

### **Task force and State Technical Committee**

Executive Committee recommends delaying decision on CWI funding until further discussion. Cherry asked the time frame on making a decision. Eddleman believes it should only take a couple months since this is a critical issue. Gentry explained the importance of taking time to make a decision and gathering all the input and partnership recommendations. The SSCB needs to know each 92 districts main concern. The SSCB needs to decide a focus before a decision is made.

Jim Droege indicated the SSCB needs to include other organization outside of the Indiana Conservation Partnership in the task force.

Lawson discussed the Executive Committee meeting. During the meeting Andy Miller mentioned the 20/20. He wants a complete understanding on CWI. There are many layers of information that need to be narrowed down to decide the main focus. The SSCB needs to sit down with IDEM and see what their needs are as far as 319 and water quality.

Eddleman likes Gentry's idea of exploring each districts needs.

Chew recommended the DSC be put in charge of pulling together the information from the SWCDs to help tackle the issue.

Droege reported that not all 92 districts gave input during the CWI discovery phase, but a good majority did.

Clemens suggested getting a direction decision made in the next couple months and then work out the fine details.

More discussion followed on survey date for SSCB committee to review.

Jennifer Boyle made a suggestion to have SWCDs e-mail their business plan and any changes they would like to make to their DSS.

Scott Trennepohl liked the idea of gathering information from DSS instead of going to each district.

Lawson suggested a letter go out to each SWCD explaining the information the SSCB needs and to submit that information to their DSS.

Jane Hardisty stated the outcome of all of this will be to funnel down information and send back the SSCB for review.

Lawson recommends that over the next two months the DSSs can gather information from their districts. Andy Miller could put together a letter to send out to local County Council and Commissioners explaining the budget and the next steps for CWI grants.

SSCB came to a consensus to make a decision in regards to the CWI funds at the October SSCB meeting.

## **5 MINUTE BREAK**

12:40 PM Eddleman called the meeting back to order.

### **ISDA Report-Tammy Lawson**

Lawson reported the DSC is working with Ohio to fill two positions in the Western Lake Erie Basin. There are 9 applications in. WLEB is moving forward and the strategic plan will be complete in the next three weeks. Ohio is looking into a watershed based project in the Wabash and would like to move quickly.

Lawson also met with Gail Peas. They would like to pull together CREP coordinators and contributors to discuss past and future plans and set new goals.

### **CREP Update -Jerod Chew (See attachments)**

Chew reported there are 500 contracts, 3,185 acres, and \$735,000 obligated to CREP.

### **District Support Update-Jerod Chew**

Chew reported that the next District visit will be August 21<sup>st</sup> and 22<sup>nd</sup> in Dubois County. He also reported the Phase I Session of the Leadership Institute is this weekend in French Lick, IN.

Chew gave his appreciation to the DSSs for doing a great job.

**CWI Grants – Amy Eizinger (See attachments)**

**DNR Report – Gary Langell – Written report will be emailed.**

**Purdue Report – Gary Steinhardt – Written report will be emailed.**

**IDEM Report – MaryLou Renshaw – See attachment**

Gentry asked where we are with Rule 5.

Renshaw responded that the next step is to contact local County Councils.

Gentry asked how people can check on progress of Rule 5 violations and enforcements.

Renshaw responded they can always call the office.

**IASWCD President's Report – Jim Droege- See attachment**

**NRCS State Conservationist's Report – Roger Kulp - See attachment**

**Farm Services Agency Report – No report**

**SWCD Foundation Report – No report**

**Leadership Development Workgroup Update – Nola Gentry**

She would like to thank the board for the approval of the \$20k revolving fund.

**Delivery System:**

Delivery System Workgroup Update – No report

**Funding:**

Funding Workgroup Update – No report

**Accountability:**

Accountability Workgroup Update – No report

**Technology – Roger Kulp**

Technology Workgroup Update – Roger Kulp

There will be a pilot mobile field office for NRCS. Details have not been worked out.

**Outreach:**

Outreach Workgroup Update – No report

**Public Comment**

There will be no September SSCB meeting. SSCB sub-committees will set meetings for September.

**Next Meeting: October 9, 2007 at 9:00 AM, location TBD**

The meeting adjourned at 1:20 PM